

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/900,551	07/06/2001	Alicia Anne Chastain	RSW920010058US1	5014
36736	7590 06/13/2006		EXAMINER	
DUKE W. Y. YEE & ASSO	EE CIATES, P.C.		LY, A	NH
P.O. BOX 802	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, TX	75380		2162	
			DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/900,551	CHASTAIN ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Anh Ly	2162

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address	I.
THE REPLY FILED 31 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandon this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, we places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41 (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of following time periods:	vhich 1.31; or
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) Mark The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is late event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITH MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension for been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set for above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	nder 37 forth in (b)
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the a Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the isappeal; and/or	sues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTO)	L-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment ca the non-allowable claim(s).	nceling
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explan how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	ation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>14,16-19 and 22</u> .	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-13,15,20,21 and 23-27</u> . <u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessand was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to p showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	<u>ot</u> be vrovide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance be See Continuation Sheet.	ecause:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	
13. Other:	
JEAN DE CORRIELUS PRIMARY EXAMINER	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Examiner maintains the rejection.

Applicants' argued that, "this Fig. 2A does not teach or otherwise suggest the receiving of any type of selection criteria with the selected text ... the selected text that a received" (Page 5, lines 9-11).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "receiving of any type of selection criteria with the selected text") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Graham et al. of 6,457,026 (hereinafter Graham) teaches a method and apparatus for augmenting electronic document display with features to enhance the experience of reading an electronic document on a display. This data processing system for reading electronic document and sharing text via Internet with remote computer users (col. 1, lines 10-15 and lines 35-50). The user may select any highlighted key phrase with the mouse (see figs. 2s, col. 3, lines 48-67 and col. 4, lines 1-28). While Clark et al. of Pub. No.: US 2004/0199529 A1 (hereinafter Clark) teaches automatically sorting and organizing stored electronic message document (abstract, sections 0003, 0007-0009, 0062 and 0083-0085; also see figs. 1B and 6).